

**MODEL SEKOLAH BERKESAN : SATU KAJIAN KES SEKOLAH-
SEKOLAH KEBANGSAAN LUAR BANDAR**

NOR ASIKIN BT SALLEH

**Diserahkan kepada Kolej Perniagaan, Universiti Utara
Malaysia bagi Memenuhi Keperluan Pengijazahan Ijazah
Doktor Falsafah
2008**



Kolej Perniagaan
(College of Business)
Universiti Utara Malaysia

PERAKUAN KERJA TESIS / DISERTASI
(Certification of thesis / dissertation)

Kami, yang bertandatangan, memperakukan bahawa
(We, the undersigned, certify that)

NOR ASIKIN SALLEH

calon untuk ijazah
(candidate for the degree of)

DOKTOR FALSAFAH (Ph.D)

telah mengemukakan tesis / disertasi yang bertajuk:
(has presented his/her thesis / dissertation of the following title):

**"MODEL SEKOLAH BERKESAN : SATU KAJIAN SEKOLAH-SEKOLAH
KEBANGSAAN LUAR BANDAR"**

seperti yang tercatat di muka surat tajuk dan kulit tesis / disertasi.
(as it appears on the title page and front cover of the thesis / dissertation).

Bahawa tesis/disertasi tersebut boleh diterima dari segi bentuk serta kandungan dan meliputi bidang ilmu dengan memuaskan, sebagaimana yang ditunjukkan oleh calon dalam ujian lisan yang diadakan pada : **13 Mac 2008**

That the said thesis/dissertation is acceptable in form and content and displays a satisfactory knowledge of the field of study as demonstrated by the candidate through an oral examination held on:
March 13, 2008

Pengerusi Viva
(Chairman for Viva)

: **Prof. Dr. Zakaria Abas**

Tandatangan
(Signature)

Pemeriksa Luar
(External Examiner)

: **Prof. Datin Dr. Sharifah Md Nor**

Tandatangan
(Signature)

Pemeriksa Dalam
(Internal Examiner)

: **Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mustapa Kassim**

Tandatangan
(Signature)

Tarikh: **March 13, 2008**
(Date)

Nama Pelajar
(Name of Student)

: Nor Asikin Salleh

Tajuk Tesis
(Title of the Thesis)

: Model Sekolah Berkesan : Satu Kajian Sekolah-Sekolah
Kebangsaan Luar Bandar

Program Pengajian
(Programme of Study)

: Doktor Falsafah (Ph.D)

Nama Penyelia/Penyelia-penyelia
(Name of Supervisor/Supervisors)

: 1. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Abdullah Hj Abdul Ghani


Tandatangan
(Signature)

: 2. Dr. Hartini Ahmad


Tandatangan
(Signature)

PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in fulfillment of the requirements for a post graduate degree from University Utara Malaysia, I agree that the University Library may make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for copying of the thesis in any manner, in whole or in part, for scholarly purposes may be granted by my supervisor or, in their absence, by the Dean o College of Business. It is understood that any copying or publication or use of the thesis or parts thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and the University Utara Malaysia for any scholarly use which may be made of any material from my thesis.

Request for permission to copy or to make other use of materials in this thesis, in whole or part, should be addressed for.

**Dean
College of Business
University Utara Malaysia
06010 UUM Sintok
Kedah Darulaman.**

MODEL SEKOLAH BERKESAN : SATU KAJIAN KES SEKOLAH-SEKOLAH KEBANGSAAN LUAR BANDAR

Abstrak

Matlamat kajian ini adalah untuk menerokai ciri-ciri yang terdapat di sekolah-sekolah berkesan. Secara khusus, kajian ini mempunyai tiga objektif utama iaitu; 1) menggunakan kaedah kualitatif bagi menjelaskan ciri-ciri sebuah sekolah berkesan di luar bandar, 2) mengetahui sejauh mana ciri-ciri yang digunakan oleh Jemaah Nazir dalam memilih sekolah-sekolah pemenang Anugerah Sekolah Harapan Negara mempunyai persamaan ataupun dapat dijelaskan oleh kerangka kajian ini dan 3) membandingkan perbezaan ciri-ciri yang terdapat di sekolah berkesan ini dengan sekolah yang kurang berkesan. Pengumpulan data kajian ini telah dilaksanakan berdasarkan kerangka yang diubahsuai daripada Mortimore (1995) yang merupakan rumusan daripada kajian-kajian terdahulu yang telah dilaksanakan di Amerika dan Eropah. Kerangka ini adalah merupakan suatu model yang menyeluruh serta mengambilkira setiap tahap dalam sesebuah sekolah. Sesuai dengan matlamat dan objektif kajian, maka kaedah pengumpulan data yang digunakan oleh penyelidik adalah secara kualitatif melalui temubual, pemerhatian penyelidik sendiri dan penelitian dokumen-dokumen sekolah yang relevan. Sampel kajian adalah terdiri daripada empat buah sekolah kebangsaan di luar bandar. Sekolah-sekolah yang dipilih adalah terdiri dari dua buah sekolah kebangsaan yang pernah memenangi Anugerah Sekolah Harapan Negara kategori luar bandar dan dua buah lagi adalah merupakan sekolah-sekolah berprestasi rendah. Keempat-empat buah sekolah tersebut terletak di dua buah negeri di utara Malaysia. Hasil kajian ini telah merumuskan bahawa terdapat tujuh ciri-ciri keberkesanan sekolah yang ketara terdapat di sekolah-sekolah berkesan yang dikaji. Ciri-ciri tersebut ialah; 1) kepimpinan pengajaran yang dikongsi bersama, 2) persekitaran yang menggalakkan pembelajaran, 3) tumpuan terhadap pengajaran dan pembelajaran, 4) jangkaan yang tinggi terhadap murid, 5) sistem pengukuhan positif, 6) memberi hak dan tanggungjawab kepada murid, 7) perkongsian antara rumah dengan sekolah. Dapatan ini telah membuktikan bahawa kesemua dimensi dalam kerangka asal Mortimore (1995) adalah kedapatan di sekolah-sekolah berkesan yang menjadi sampel kajian. Selanjutnya kajian ini telah merumuskan bahawa sekolah-sekolah yang telah memenangi Anugerah Sekolah Harapan Negara ini sesungguhnya mempunyai ciri-ciri yang sama dengan sekolah-sekolah berkesan diperingkat antarabangsa.

EFFECTIVE SCHOOL MODEL: A CASE STUDY OF RURAL PRIMARY SCHOOLS

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to explore the characteristics that exist in effective schools. Specifically, there are three objectives for the study namely; 1) using the qualitative method of data collection to explain the characteristics of effective schools in the rural areas, 2) discover how far do the criteria set by the School Inspectorate in the selection of the winners of the “Anugerah Sekolah Harapan Negara” actually have similarities or is explained by the framework of this study, 3) compare the differences between the characteristics of the more effective and the less effective schools. The data was obtained through interviews and observations using a framework that was adapted from Mortimore (1995), which is a review of school effectiveness research conducted in the United States and Europe. This is comprehensive model which involves every level in a school. Considering the purpose and goal for this study, the method for data collection is a qualitative method through interviews, researcher’s own observation and the study of relevant school documents. Four rural primary schools were selected as samples for the study. The selected samples consist of two primary schools that have won the titles of “Sekolah Harapan Negara” for the category of rural schools while the other two are less effective schools in the same category. All four schools are situated in two northern states of Peninsular Malaysia. The findings of this study suggested that there are seven characteristics that are prevalent in both effective schools. The characteristics are; 1) shared instructional leadership, 2) a learning environment, 3) concentration on teaching and learning, 4) high expectation for students, 5) positive reinforcement, 6) providing pupil rights and responsibilities, and 7) home-school partnership. The findings concluded that all the dimensions in Mortimore (1995) indeed exist in the sample schools. Furthermore, the study also suggested that the winners of “Anugerah Sekolah Harapan Negara” possess similar characteristics to the effective schools at international level.

PENGHARGAAN

Saya ingin merakamkan perasaan syukur kehadiran Allah swt atas rahmatNya yang membolehkan saya menyempurnakan tesis ini. Hanya dengan kekuatan dan petunjukNya dapat saya melaksanakan kerja-kerja pengumpulan data dan penulisan kajian dengan lancar dan jayanya.

Penghasilan tesis ini adalah gambaran sumbangan, bantuan, serta sokongan oleh beberapa pihak dalam proses saya menyempurnakannya. Ucapan terima kasih yang tulus ikhlas ingin saya tujukan kepada semua pihak yang telah memberikan sokongan dalam bentuk idea, nasihat, bimbingan serta tunjuk ajar yang berterusan. Saya ingin mengucapkan rasa terima kasih dan penghargaan kepada kedua orang penasihat saya iaitu Profesor Madya Dr. Hj. Abdullah Abdul Ghani dan Dr. Hartini Ahmad atas bimbingan dan tunjuk ajar yang telah mereka berikan selama saya menjalankan kajian dan menulis tesis ini. Ucapan terima kasih yang istimewa ingin saya tujukan kepada Dr. Hj Ishak bin Sin atas sumbangan idea serta tunjuk ajar beliau sejak kajian ini bermula. Ucapan terima kasih ini turut saya tujukan kepada Profesor Madya Dr. Mustapha Kassim serta Profesor Datin Dr. Sharifah Md Nor atas sumbangan idea, komen serta cadangan yang telah mereka berikan.

Saya juga ingin mengucapkan terima kasih kepada Profesor Dr. Zakaria Abas dan Profesor Dr. Rushaimi Zein atas minat serta kesudian mereka untuk meluangkan masa dan turut serta dalam peperiksaan lisan bagi mempertahankan tesis PhD ini.

Akhir sekali penghargaan teristimewa ingin saya rakamkan buat kedua ibu bapa saya, Hajjah Halijah Md Isa dan Haji Salleh Abu Bakar yang sentiasa berdoa untuk kejayaan saya. Penghargaan teristimewa juga ingin saya tujukan kepada suami saya, Azizan bin Kassim, anak-anak saya Muhd Ridhwan, Muhd Radhi, Nurul Nadzirah dan terutamanya kepada anak ketiga saya Nurul Wahidah yang banyak membantu dalam kerja-kerja pengeditan dan percetakan tesis ini. Kasih sayang dan sokongan mereka telah benar-benar memberikan inspirasi kepada saya. Semoga Allah swt merahmati kita semua.

KANDUNGAN

Muka surat

PERKARA

Kebenaran Penggunaan	ii
Abstrak	iii
Abstract	iv
Penghargaan	v
Kandungan	vi
Senarai Lampiran	x
Senarai Jadual	xi

BAB SATU PENGENALAN

1.0	Pendahuluan	1
1.1	Masalah Kajian	15
1.2	Kepentingan Kajian	22
1.3	Objektif Kajian	28
1.4	Kerangka Kajian	29
1.5	Batasan Kajian dan Andaian	31
1.6	Definisi Istilah	32
1.7	Rumusan	34

BAB DUA SOROTAN LITERATUR

2.0	Pendahuluan	36
2.1	Asas Teori Keberkesanan Organisasi Sekolah	38
2.2	Perkembangan Gerakan Sekolah Berkesan	40
2.3	Kajian Sekolah Berkesan di Asia dan Dunia Ketiga	44
2.4	Kajian Sekolah-sekolah Berkesan di Luar Bandar	46
2.5	Kajian-kajian Sekolah Berkesan di Malaysia	48
2.6	Faktor-faktor Dalaman dan Luaran yang Menentukan Keberkesanan Sekolah	52
2.6.1	Faktor-faktor Dalaman	53
2.6.1.1	Mengutamakan Kepentingan Murid bagi Meningkatkan Pembelajaran	53
2.6.1.2	Kepimpinan yang Mantap	53
2.6.1.3	Kepimpinan Pengajaran	54

2.6.1.4	Kerjasama dikalangan Staf	56
2.6.2	Faktor-faktor Luaran	57
2.6.2.1	Hubungan Sekolah dengan Pihak Atasan	57
2.6.2.2	Hubungan Sekolah dengan Ibu Bapa dan Komuniti	59
2.7	Ciri-Ciri Sekolah Berkesan oleh Mortimore (1995)	59
2.7.1	Kepimpinan Profesional	62
2.7.1.1	Kepimpinan yang Tegas dan Bermatlamat	63
2.7.1.2	Melibatkan Staf Lain dalam Membuat Keputusan	64
2.7.1.3	Kepakaran dalam Pengajaran dan Pembelajaran	65
2.7.2	Visi dan Matlamat yang dikongsi Bersama	66
2.7.2.1	Penyatuan Matlamat	67
2.7.2.2	Amalan-Amalan Kerja yang Tekal	67
2.7.2.3	Kesejawatanan dan Kerjasama	68
2.7.3	Persekitaran yang Menggalakkan Pembelajaran	69
2.7.3.1	Suasana yang Teratur	69
2.7.3.2	Persekitaran Tempat Kerja yang Menarik	70
2.7.4	Tumpuan Kepada Pengajaran dan Pembelajaran	70
2.7.4.1	Memaksimumkan Masa Pembelajaran	71
2.7.4.2	Penekanan dalam Hal-hal Akademik	72
2.7.5	Pengajaran yang Bermatlamat	72
2.7.5.1	Pengelolaan yang Cepak	73
2.7.5.2	Jelas Tentang Objektif Sesi Pengajaran	74
2.7.5.3	Pengajaran yang Berstruktur	74
2.7.5.4	Amalan yang Berubah Mengikut Keperluan	75
2.7.6	Jangkaan yang Tinggi Terhadap Murid	75
2.7.6.1	Jangkaan Tinggi dalam Semua Bidang	76
2.7.6.2	Menyatakan Jangkaan	76
2.7.6.3	Memberikan Cabaran yang Intelektual	77
2.7.7	Pengukuhan Positif	77
2.7.7.1	Disiplin yang Jelas dan Adil	78
2.7.7.2	Maklum Balas	78
2.7.8	Memantau Kemajuan Murid dan Sekolah	78
2.7.8.1	Memantau Kemajuan Murid	79
2.7.8.2	Menilai Prestasi Sekolah	79
2.7.9	Memberikan Hak dan Tanggungjawab Murid	80
2.7.9.1	Meningkatkan Harga Diri Murid	80
2.7.9.2	Memegang Jawatan yang Mempunyai Tanggungjawab	81
2.7.9.3	Kawalan ke atas Kerja	81
2.7.10	Perkongsian Rumah dan Sekolah	82
2.7.10.1	Penglibatan Ibu Bapa	82
2.7.11	Sekolah Sebagai Sebuah Organisasi Pembelajaran	83

2.8	Lain-Lain Dapatan Kajian Tentang Sekolah Berkesan	85
2.9	Rumusan	91

BAB TIGA

KAEDAH KAJIAN

3.0	Pendahuluan	93
3.1	Kerangka Konsep Kajian	94
3.2	Reka Bentuk Kajian	100
3.3	Latar Belakang Penyelidik	103
3.4	Pembinaan Item-Item Soalan Temubual dan Senarai Semak Pemerhatian	104
3.5	Kesahan dan Kebolehpercayaan Item-item Soalan	106
3.6	Sampel Kajian	111
3.7	Tatacara Pengumpulan Data	116
3.8	Tatacara Penganalisan Data	118
3.9	Rumusan	121

BAB 4

DAPATAN KAJIAN

4.0	Pendahuluan	123
4.1	Latar Belakang Sekolah-sekolah Sampel Kajian	125
4.1.1	Sekolah Kebangsaan A	125
4.1.2	Sekolah Kebangsaan B	127
4.1.3	Sekolah Kebangsaan C	139
4.1.4	Sekolah Kebangsaan D	130
4.2	Persamaan antara Sekolah Kebangsaan A, B, C dan D	132
4.3	Dapatan Berdasarkan Kerangka Kajian	134
4.3.1	Kepimpinan Pengajaran	134
4.3.2	Visi dan Matlamat yang dikongsi Bersama	148
4.3.3	Persekitaran yang Menggalakkan Pembelajaran	155
4.3.4	Tumpuan Terhadap Pengajaran dan Pembelajaran	165
4.3.5	Pengajaran yang Bermatlamat	172
4.3.6	Jangkaan yang Tinggi Terhadap Murid	177
4.3.7	Pengukuhan yang Positif	183
4.3.8	Memantau Kemajuan	190
4.3.9	Memberi Hak dan Tanggungjawab Murid	194
4.3.10	Perkongsian Rumah-Sekolah yang Mantap	197
4.3.11	Sekolah Sebagai Organisasi Pembelajaran	202
4.3.12	Hubungan Sekolah dengan Pihak Atasan	207
4.4	Rumusan	209

BAB 5

PERBINCANGAN, KESIMPULAN DAN CADANGAN

5.0	Pendahuluan	211
5.1	Perbincangan Dapatan Kajian	213
5.1.1	Kepimpinan Pengajaran	213
5.1.2	Visi dan Matlamat yang dikongsi Bersama	222
5.1.3	Persekitaran yang Menggalakkan Pembelajaran	224
5.1.4	Tumpuan Terhadap Pengajaran dan Pembelajaran	227
5.1.5	Pengajaran yang Bermatlamat	229
5.1.6	Jangkaan yang Tinggi Terhadap Murid	232
5.1.7	Pengukuhan yang Positif	234
5.1.8	Pemantauan Kemajuan Murid dan Sekolah yang Sistematis	236
5.1.9	Memberi Hak dan Tanggungjawab Murid	237
5.1.10	Perkongsian Rumah-Sekolah yang Mantap	239
5.1.11	Sekolah Sebagai Organisasi Pembelajaran	241
5.1.12	Hubungan Sekolah dengan Pihak Atasan	244
5.2	Ke arah Pembinaan Suatu Kerangka Teori Kajian	246
5.3	Kesimpulan Kajian	251
5.4	Implikasi Kajian	253
5.5	Cadangan Kajian akan Datang	255
5.6	Rumusan	260
	 RUJUKAN	 261

SENARAI LAMPIRAN

		Muka surat
Lampiran A	Kerangka Kajian Kes	279
Lampiran B	Senarai Semak Pemerhatian Penyelidik di Sekolah	281
Lampiran C	Soalan Temubual Separa Berstruktur dengan Guru Besar	285
Lampiran D	Soalan Temubual Separa Berstruktur dengan Guru	291
Lampiran E	Contoh Helaian Log Temubual dengan Guru Besar dan Guru	297
Lampiran F	Contoh Helaian Log Pemerhatian di Sekolah	298
Lampiran G	Surat Permohonan Melaksanakan Kajian	299
Lampiran H	Surat Kebenaran daripada Kementerian Pelajaran Malaysia untuk Menjalankan Kajian	300
Lampiran I	Surat Kebenaran daripada Jabatan Pelajaran Negeri Perlis untuk Menjalankan Kajian	302
Lampiran J	Surat Kebenaran daripada Jabatan Pelajaran Negeri Kedah untuk Menjalankan Kajian	303
Lampiran K	Rekod Aktiviti Pengumpulan Data Kualitatif oleh Penyelidik	304
Lampiran L	Gambar-gambar Menunjukkan Persekitaran yang Menyokong Pembelajaran di Sekolah Berkesan (A dan B) dan Sekolah tidak Berkesan (C dan D)	312

SENARAI JADUAL DAN RAJAH

		Muka surat
Jadual 1	Rumusan Tinjauan Literatur dalam Kajian Keberkesanan Sekolah	86
Rajah 1	Kerangka Konsep kajian sekolah Berkesan	31
Jadual 2	Kerangka Kajian Kes	99
Rajah 2	Model Sekolah Berkesan	251

BAB SATU

PENGENALAN

1.0 Pendahuluan

Menyedari bahawa masa depan negara adalah bergantung kepada generasi masa kini, maka persoalan keberkesanan sistem pendidikan khasnya persekolahan adalah menjadi isu penting. Ini adalah kerana generasi akan datang terbentuk hasil daripada pendidikan yang wujud pada masa ini. Selaras dengan itu, kerajaan Malaysia dengan seriusnya telah mengambil tindakan meningkatkan keberkesanan sekolah melalui usaha memperkasakan sekolah kebangsaan. Agenda memperkasakan sekolah kebangsaan ini jelas dinyatakan dalam ucapan perutusan tahun Menteri Pelajaran Malaysia pada 4hb Januari 2005 di mana beliau telah meminta supaya Kementerian Pelajaran Malaysia memberi tumpuan kepada empat tugas utama. Hal ini adalah sebagai usaha dalam meningkatkan akses, ekuiti dan kualiti pendidikan di negara ini. Empat tugas utama tersebut ialah: pertama, memperkasakan sekolah kebangsaan, agar ia menjadi pilihan utama rakyat. Kedua, memperkukuhkan kurikulum; agar selari dengan keperluan negara dan bertaraf dunia. Ketiga, memastikan pembangunan pendidikan yang seimbang di bandar dan di luar bandar; agar jurang digital, jurang antara miskin dan kaya serta jurang antara yang ada dan yang tiada dapat dirapatkan. Keempat, memartabatkan profesion keguruan, agar profesion ini dihormati dan dipandang tinggi sesuai dengan amanah yang dipikulnya sebagai profesion yang berada di barisan paling hadapan dalam pembinaan generasi masa hadapan negara.

The contents of
the thesis is for
internal user
only

Rujukan

- Koleksi abstrak disertasi kedoktoran mengenai pendidikan di Malaysia.* (2003).
- Standard kualiti pendidikan Malaysia-sekolah (Instrumen pemastian standard).* (2004)
- Kementerian sedar wujud murid tidak tahu membaca. (2005, 13 Oktober). *Utusan Malaysia*.
- Perutusan Tahun Baru Menteri Pelajaran Malaysia.* (2005) Putrajaya: PICC.
- Rancangan Malaysia ke-9: Pelan induk pembangunan pendidikan 2006-2010.* (2007).
- Abdul Karim Mohd Nor. (1989). *Characteristics of effective rural secondary schools in Malaysia.* University of Wisconsin, Madison.
- Ainsworth, M., & Batten, E. (1974). *The effects of environmental factors on secondary educational attainment in Manchester: A Plowden follow-up.* London: Macmillan.
- Alexander, K. L. (1992). *Policy and practice in primary education.* London: Routledge.
- Anderson, L. W., Ryan, D. W., & Shapiro, B. J. (1989). *The IEA classroom environment study.* Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Anderson, L. W., & Simmons, J. (1975). The classroom environment study. *Comparative Education Review*, 31(1), 69-87.
- Argyris, C. (1958). Some problems in conceptualizing organizational climate: A case study of a bank. *Administrative Science Quarterly*(2), 501-520.
- Armor, D., Conry-Oseguera, P., Cox, M., King, N., McDonnell, L., Pascal, A., et al. (1976). *Analysis of the reading program in selected Los Angeles minority schools.* Santa Monica: Rand.
- Atan Long, I. R., Abdul Aziz Sultan, Mohd Nor Long, Mohd Sahari Nordin, Nik Ahmad Hisham Ismail, Ratnawati Asraf, & Rosnani Hashim. . (3-5 Januari 1991.). *Faktor-faktor yang menyumbang kepada peningkatan kemajuan sekolah-sekolah: Kajian kes.* . Paper presented at the Seminar Latihan Mengajar Antara Universiti Kali ke 7. Universiti Islam Antarabangsa, Kuala Lumpur.
- Austin, G. R. (1979). Exemplary schools and the search for effectiveness. *Educational Leadership*, 37(1), 10-14.
- Azinger, A. T., & Baker, P., J. (2003). Measures short on follow through. *Illinois School Board Journal* (July/August).
- Babak, A. S., & McCormick, J. (2004). A cross-cultural analysis of the effectiveness of the Learning Organisation model in school contexts. *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 18(7), 408-416.

- Balderson, J. H. (1977). Who likes the "Good School"? *The Canadian Administrator* 16, 1-4.
- Bandura, A. (1992). *Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, San Francisco.
- Barber, M. (July 1993). *Raising standards in deprived urban areas*. London: NCE.
- Bardach, E. (1977). *The implementation game: What happens after a Bill becomes law*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Barth, R. S. (1990). A personal vision of a good school. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 71(7), 512- 514.
- Beck, L. G., & Murphy, J. (1994). *Ethics in educational leadership programs: An expanding role*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Beck, L. G., & Murphy, J. (1996). *The four imperatives of a successful school*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Bell, J. (2002). Questionnaires. In M. Coleman & A. R. J. Briggs (Eds.), *Research methods in educational leadership and management* (pp. 159-171). London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Berg, B. L. (2004). *Qualitative research method for the social sciences (5th ed)*. Boston: Pearson.
- Binkowski, K., Cordeiro, P., & Iwanicki, E. (1995). *A qualitative study of higher and lower performing elementary schools*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of The American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, California.
- Blase, J., & Blase, J. (1999). Effective instructional leadership: Teachers' perspectives on how principals promote teaching and learning in schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38(2), 130-141.
- Bloom, B. S. (1976). *Human characteristics and school learning*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2003). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods* (4 ed.). Boston: : Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1991). *Images of leadership* (Occasional Paper no.7). Harvard Graduate School of Education: The National Center for Educational Leadership.
- Borg, W. R. (1987). *Educational research: A practical guide for teachers* (2nd ed.). White Plains, N.Y: Longman.

- Bosker, R. J., & Witziers, B. (1996). *The magnitude of school effects, or: does it really matter what school a student attends?* Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY.
- Brookover, W., & Erickson, E. (1975). *Sociology of education*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press.
- Brookover, W., Schweitzer, J., Schneider, J., Beady, C., Flood, P., & Wisenbaker, J. (1978). Elementary school social climate and school achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 15, 137-156.
- Brookover, W. B., Beady, C., Flood, P., Schweitzer, J., & Wisenbaker, J. (1979). *School social system and students achievement: schools make a difference*. New York: Praeger.
- Brookover, W. B., & Lezotte, L. W. (1979). *Changes in school characteristics coincident with changes in student achievement*. East Lansing: Institute for Research on Teaching, College of Education, Michigan University.
- Brophy, J. E., & Good, T. I. (1986). Teacher behaviour and student achievement In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan.
- Brown, K. M., Anfara Jr, V. A., & Roney, K. (2004). Student achievement in high performing, suburban middle schools and low performing, urban middle schools. *Education and Urban Society*, 36(4), 428-456.
- Cahill, D. J. (1996). When to use qualitative methods: a new approach. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 14(6), 16-20.
- Cameron, K. S. (1981a). A study of organisational effectiveness and its predictors. *Journal of Management Science*, 32(1), 87-112.
- Campbell, J. P. (1977). On the nature of organisational effectiveness. In P. S. Goodman & J. M. Pennings (Eds.), *New perspectives on organisational effectiveness* (pp. 13-55). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Chan, Y. C., & Cheng, Y. C. (1993). A study of principal's instructional leadership in Hong Kong secondary schools'. *Educational Research Journal*, 8, 55-67.
- Cheng, Y. C. (1994). Classroom environment and student affective performance : An effective profile *Journal of Experimental Education*, 63(3), 221-239.
- Cheng, Y. C. (1994). Principal's leadership as a critical factor for school performance: Evidence from multi-levels of primary schools. *Journal of School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 5(3), 299-317.
- Cheng, Y. C., Cheung, W. M., & Tam, W. M. (2002). The Pacific Rim and Australia-Hong Kong. In D. Reynolds, B. Creemers, S. Stringfield, C. Teddlie & G. Schaffer (Eds.), *World class schools: international perspectives on school effectiveness*. New York: Routledge Falmer.

- Chien, J. C. (2004). *Examining a successful urban elementary school: Putting the pieces together*. University of Southern California, Los Angeles.
- Clark, D. L., Lotto, L. S., & Astuto, T. A. (1984). Effective schools and school improvement: A comparative analysis of two lines of inquiry. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 20(3), 41-68.
- Cohn, E., & Rossmiller, R. A. (1987). Research on effective schools: Implications for less developed countries. *Comparative Education Review*, 31(3), 377-399.
- Coleman, J., Hoffer, T., & Killgore, S. (1981). *Public and private schools*. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center.
- Coleman, J. S., Campbell, E. Q., Hobson, C. F., McPartland, J., Mood, A. M., Weinfeld, F. D., et al. (1966). *Equality of educational opportunity*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.
- Connolly, T., Conlon, E. J., & Deutch, S. J. (1980). Organisational effectiveness: A multiple-constituency approach. *Academy of Management Review*, 5, 211-217.
- Conran, P. (1989). *School superintendents' complete handbook*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Cotton, K. (1995). *Effective school practices: A research synthesis (1995 update)*. Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.
- Craig, J., Butler, A., Leslie Cairo, I., Wood, C., Gilchrist, C., Holloway, J., et al. (2005). *A case study of six high-performing schools in Tennessee*. Edvantia: Appalachia Educational Laboratory.
- Creemers, B. P. M. (1994). The history, purpose and value of school effectiveness studies. In D. Reynolds, et al (Ed.), *Advances in school effectiveness research and practice*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Cuban, L. (1983). Effective schools: A friendly but cautionary note *Phi Delta Kappan*, 64(10), 695-696.
- Davis, G. A., & Thomas, M. A. (1989). *Effective schools and effective teachers*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- DeBevoise. (1984). Synthesis of research on the principal as instructional leader. *Educational leadership*, 42(2), 14-20.
- Dimmock, W. H. (1993). Instructional leadership in primary and secondary schools in Western Australia. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 31(2), 43-62.

- Dionne, S. D., Yammarino, F. J., Atwater, L., & Sprangler, W. D. (2004). Transformational leadership and team performance. *Journal of Organisational Change Management*, 17(2), 177-193.
- Dobbs, K. (January 2000). Simple Moments of Learning. *Training*, 37(1), 52-58.
- Doll, R. (1996). *Curriculum improvement: Decision making and process*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Doyle, W. (1986). Classroom organisation and management. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 392-431). New York: McMillan.
- Dyer, W. G. J., & Wilkins, A. L. (1991). Better stories not better constructs, to generate better stories: A rejoinder to Eisenhardt. *Academy of Management Review* 16(3), 613-619.
- Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership*, 37(1), 15- 23.
- Edmonds, R. R. (1982). Programs of school improvement: An overview. *Educational Leadership*, 40(3), 4-11.
- Eisenhardt, K. (1989). Building theories from case study research. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4), 532-550.
- Etzioni, A. (1964). *Modern organisations*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Eubanks, E. E., & Levine, D. U. (1983). A first look at effective schools project in New York City and Milwaukee. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 64(10), 607 - 702.
- Evertson, C., Anderson, C., Anderson, L., & Brophy, J. (1980). Relationships between classroom and student outcomes in junior high mathematics and English classes. *American Educational Research Journal*, 17, 43-60.
- Fertig, M. (2000). Old wine in new bottles? Researching effective schools in developing countries. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 11(3), 385-403.
- Forde, J., & Butler, J. (1996). Enhancing school public relations through community partnership. *The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin*, 62(19), 9-14.
- Fraser, B., Walberg, H. J., Welch, W. W., & Hattie, J. A. (1987). Synthesis of educational productivity research. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 11(2).
- Fraser, B. J., & Walberg, H. J. (Eds.). (1991). *Educational environments: evaluation, antecedents and consequences*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Friedman, B. A., Bobrowski, P. E., & Markow, D. (2007). Predictors of parents satisfaction with their children's school. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 46(3), 278-288.

- Fullan, M. (1993). *Change Forces: Probing the Depths of Educational Reform*. Farmer, Bristol, PA.
- Fullan, M. G. (1982). *The meaning of education*. New York: Teachers College and Press.
- Fullan, M. G. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change*. London: Cassell.
- Fullan, M. G., & Hargreaves, A. (1991). *What's worth fighting for: Working together for your school*. Toronto: Ontario Public School Teachers' Federation.
- Gabbard, D. A. (Ed.). (2000). *Knowledge and power in the global economy*. New Jersey: Erlbaum.
- Galton, M., & Simon, B. (1980). *Progress and performance in the primary classroom*. London: Routledge and Keegan Paul.
- Garvin, D. A. (1993). Building a learning organization. *Harvard Business Review* (July-August), 78-91.
- Geert, T. D., & Monique, V. (2001). The leeway of qualitative educational research: a case study. *Qualitative Studies in Education* 14(6), 737-769.
- Gerber, R. (1998). How do workers learn in their work? *The Learning Organization* 5(4), 168-175.
- Glasser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory. Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago, IL: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Goddard, R. D., Sweetland, S.R, Hoy, Wayne. K. (December 2000). Academic emphasis of urban elementary schools and student achievement in reading and mathematics: A multilevel analysis. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 36(5), 683-702.
- Goetz, J., & LeCompte, M. (1984). *Ethnography and qualitative design In educational research*. San Deigo: American Press, Inc.
- Gonzales-DeHass, R, A., Willems, P. P., Holbein, & Doan, M. F. (2005). Examining the relationship between parental involvement and student motivation. *Educational Psychology Review*, 17(2), 99-123.
- Good, T. L., & Brophy, J. E. (1986). School effects In M. Wittrock (Ed.), *Third handbook on research and teaching* (pp. 570-602). New York: MacMillan.
- Goodlad, J. (1984). *A place called school: Prospects for the future*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1994a). *What schools are for (2nd ed.)* Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation
- Greenfield, W. D., Jr. (1995). Toward a theory of school administration: the centrality of leadership. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 31(1), 61 - 85.

- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gurr, D. (1996). On conceptualising school leadership: time to abandon transformational leadership? *Leading and Managing*, 2(3), 221-239.
- Gurr, D., Drysdale, L., Di Natale, E., Ford, P., Hardy, R., & Swann, R. (2003). Successful school leadership in Victoria: three case studies. *Leading and Managing*, 10(1), 45-76.
- Gurr, D., Drysdale, L., & Mulford, B. (2005). Successful principal leadership: Australian case studies. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 43(6), 539-551.
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. (1997). *Epistemological frames and method for the study of school leadership*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Hallinger, P., & Leithwood, K. (1994). Introduction: Exploring the impact of principal leadership. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 5(3), 206-218.
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1985). Assessing the instructional leadership behavior of principals. *The Elementary School Journal*, 86(2), 217-248.
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (Eds.). (1987). *Instructional leadership in the school context in Greenfield, W. (ed)*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. (1986). The social context of effective schools. *American Journal of Education*, 94, 328-355.
- Halpin, A. W. (1966). *Theory and research in administration*. New York: McMillan Co.
- Hargreaves, D. H. (1990). Accountability and school improvement in the work of LEA inspectorates: The rhetoric and beyond. *Journal of Education Policy*, 5(3), 230-239.
- Harris, A. (1999). *Teaching and learning in the effective school*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Hellriegel, D., Jackson, S. E., & Slocum Jr, J. W. (1999). *Management*. Cincinnati, Ohio: South-Western College Publishing.
- Helmreich, R. (1972). Stress, self-esteem and attitudes, in B. King and E. McGinnies (Eds.). In *Attitudes, conflict and social change*. London: Academic Press.
- Hersch, R., Carnine, D., Gall, M., Stockard, J., Carmack, M., & Gannon, P. (1981). *The management of education professionals in instructionally effective school effective schools: towards a research agenda*. Eugene: Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon.

- Hester, P., Gable, R., & Manning, M. L. (2003). A learning environment approach to middle school instruction. *Childhood education*(Spring).
- Hoffman, J. V. (1991). Teacher and school effects in learning to read. In R. Barr, M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, & P. D. Pearson (Eds.). In *Handbook of reading research, Vol. II* (pp. 911-950). New York: Longman.
- Hofman, R., Hofman, W., & Guldermond, H. (2001). Social context effects on pupils' perception of school. *Learning and Instruction, 11*, 171-194.
- Hopkins, D., Ainscow, M., & West, M. (1994). *School improvement in an era of change*. London: Cassell.
- Hoy, W. K. (1990). Organizational climate and culture: A conceptual analysis of the school workplace. *Journal of Psychological and Educational Consultation* (1), 149-168.
- Hoy, W. K., & Clover, S. I. R. (1986). Elementary school climate: A revision of the OCDQ. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 22*, 93-110.
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (1991). *Educational administration: Theory, research and practice*. (4 ed.). Singapore: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Hoy, W. K., & Sabo, D. J. (1998). *Quality middle schools: open and healthy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Hoy, W. K., Tarter, C. J., & Kottkamp, R. B. (1990). School health and organizational commitment. *Journal of Research and Development in Education, 23*(4), 236-242. <http://faculty.ncwc.edu/toconner/308/308lect09.htm>.
- Hussein Mahmood. (1989). *A study of principal's perceptions of their competency of their competency needs in institutional leadership*. University of Michigan.
- Ishak Sin. (2004). Sekolah berkesan: Amalan-amalan dalam pengurusan dan kepimpinan. *Jurnal Pengurusan dan Kepimpinan Pendidikan, Institut Aminuddin Baki, Kementerian Pelajaran Malaysia, 14*(2), 1-21.
- Jackson, P. W. (1968). *Life in classroom*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Jencks, C. S., Smith, M., Ackland, H., Bane, M. J., Cohen, D., Ginter, H., et al. (1972). *Inequality: A reassessment of the effect of family and schooling in America* New York: Basic Books.
- Jensen, A. R. (1969). How much can we boost I.Q. & scholastic achievement? . *Harvard Educational Review, 39*(1), 2-123.
- Jesse, D., Davis, A., & Pokorny, N. (2004). High-achieving middle schools for latino students in poverty. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at risk, 9*(1), 23-45.

- Johnson, J. P., Schwartz, R. A., Livingston, M., & Slate, J. R. (2000). What makes a good elementary school? A critical examination. *Journal of Educational Research*, 93(6), 339-348.
- Kahn, R. L. (1977). Organisational effectiveness: An overview. In P. S. Goodman & J. M. Pennings (Eds.), *New perspective on organisational efectiveness* (pp. 235-248). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kala, S. R., Ng, P.T. (2006). The challenges of adopting the learning organisation philosophy in a Singapore school. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 20(2), 140-152.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1966). *The social psychology of organizations(1st ed)*. New York: Wiley.
- Kazuo, K. (1995). *Effective school research from Japanese perspective*. Paper presented at the North-East/Mid-West Regional Conference of The Comparative and International Education Society, Buffalo, New York.
- Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia. (1989). *Kajian keberkesanan sekolah*. Kuala Lumpur: Bahagian Perancangan dan Penyelidikan.
- Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia. (2003). *Koleksi abstrak disertasi kedoktoran mengenai pendidikan di Malaysia*. Kuala Lumpur: Bahagian Perancangan dan Penyelidikan.
- King, M. B., & Newman, F. M. (2001). Building school capacity through professional development: conceptual and empirical considerations. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 15(2), 86-94.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2002). *The leadership challenge (3rd ed)*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Krug, S. E. (1992). Instructional leadeship:A constructivist perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 28(3), 430-443.
- Lahui-Ako, B. (2001). The instructional leadership behaviour of Papua New Guinea high school principals - A provincial case study. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 39(3), 233-265.
- Lashway, L. (2002). Trends in school leadership. *ERIC Digest* Retrieved March 5th, 2005, from <http://eric.uoregon.edu/edu/publications/digests/digest162.html>
- Lasley, T., & Wayson, W. (1982). Characteristics of schools with good discipline. *Educational Leadership*, 40(3), 28-31.
- LeCompte, M. D. (1997). Trends in Qualitative Research Methods. In L. J. Saha (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of the sociology of education* (pp. 246-263). Oxford/New York/Tokyo: Pergamon.

- Lee, V., Bryk, A., & Smith, M. (1993). The organisation of effective secondary schools In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed.), *Research in education* (pp. 171-226). Washington DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Leithwood, K. (1994). Leadership for school restructuring. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 30, 498-518.
- Leithwood, K., Jantzi, D., & Steinbach, R. (1995). An organizational learning perspective on school responses to central policy initiatives. *School Organisation*, 15(3), 229-249.
- Leithwood, K. A., & Montgomery, D. J. (1982). The role of elementary school principal in program improvement. *Review of Educational Research*, 52, 309-399.
- Leithwood, K. A., & Riehl, C. (Autumn 2003). *What we know about successful school leadership: A Report by Division of AERA*. London: National College for School Leadership.
- Levine, D., and Stark, J. (1981). *Instructional and organisational arrangements and processes for improving academic achievement at inner city elementary schools*. Kansas City, Missouri: University of Missouri.
- Levine, L. W., & Lezotte, L. W. (1990). *Unusually effective schools: A review and analysis of research and practice*. Madison, WI: National Center for Effective Schools Research and Development.
- Lightfoot, S. (1983). *The good high school: Portraits of character and culture*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic enquiry*. London: Sage.
- Lipham, J. M. (1981). *Effective principal, effective school*. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.
- Lipsitz, J. (1984). *Successful schools for young adolescents*. New Brunswick, N.J: Transaction Book.
- Lipsitz, S. (1984). *Successful schools for young adolescents*. New Brunswick: Transaction Books.
- Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: a sociological study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Loxley, W. A. (1983). The impact of primary school quality on learning in Egypt. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 3, 33-45.
- Mackey, B., Pitcher, S., Decman, J. (2006). The influence of four elementary principals upon their schools' reading programs and students' reading scores. *Education*(Fall).
- Malaysia. (1996). *Akta Pendidikan 1996 (Akta 550)*: International Law Book Services.

- Malaysia. (2007). *Rancangan Malaysia ke-9: Pelan induk pembangunan pendidikan 2006-2010*. Retrieved from <http://www.moe.gov.my/pipp2006/>.
- Mandeville, G. K., & Kennedy, E. (1991). The relationship of effective schools indicators and changes in the social distribution of achievement. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 2(1), 14-33.
- Marzano, R. J. (2003). *What works in school: Translating research into action*. : Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- McCallum, B. (1999). Literacy in four effective schools. *School Leadership & Management*, 19(1), 7-24.
- Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis - An expanded Sourcebook*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Mohamed Suhaimi bin Mohd Ali. (2004). *Amalan Kepimpinan Pengajaran Pengetua Sekolah Menengah Luar Bandar*. Universiti Putra Malaysia, Bangi, Malaysia.
- Mohd Majid Konting. (1990). *Kaedah penyelidikan pendidikan*. Kuala Lumpur.: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Moos, L., Krejsler, J., Kofod, K. K., & Jensen, B. B. (2005). Successful school principalship in Danish schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 43(6), 563-572.
- Mortimore, P., Sammons, P., Stoll, L, Lewis, D., and Ecob, R. (1988). *School matters: The junior years*. Wells: Open Books.
- Mortimore, P. (1991). Effective schools from a British perspective, Chapter 7. In J. R. Bliss, W. A., Firestone & C. E., Richards (Ed.), *Rethinking effective schools: Research and practice*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Mortimore., P., Sammons.P, and Hillman.J., (1995, 13-14 July). *Key characteristics of effective schools: a review of school effectiveness research*. Paper presented at the Effective School Seminar, Institut Aminuddin Baki Kementerian Pendidikan Malaysia.
- Murphy, J. (1989). Principal instructional leadership. In P. Thurston & L. Lotto (Eds.), *Advances in educational leadership*. Greenwich: JAI Press.
- Murphy, J. (1991). Superintendents as saviors: From the terminator to pogo. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 72(7), 507-513.
- Nadler, D. A., & Tusman, M. I. (1980). A congruence model for organisational assessment. In E. Lawler, D. A. Nadler & C. Cammann (Eds.), *Organisational Assessment: Perspective On the Measurement on the Organisational Behaviour and the Quality of Working Life* (pp. 261-178). New York: Wiley.

- Nir, A. E., & Ami, T. (2005). School-parents relationship in the era of school-based management: harmony and conflict? *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 4, 55-72.
- Nir, A. E., & Eyal, O. (2003). School-based management and the role conflict of the school superintendent. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 41(5), 547-564.
- Northwest Regional Education Laboratory. (1990). *Onward to excellence: Effective schooling practices: A research synthesis*. Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Education Laboratory.
- Patton., M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications Inc.
- Perrow, C. (1961). The Analysis of Goals in Complex Organisation. *American Sociological Review* (December), 854-866.
- Perry, C. (1998). Processes of a case study methodology for postgraduate research in marketing. *European Journal of Marketing*, 32(9/10), 785-803.
- Pollack, S., Watson, D., & Chrispeels, J. (1987). *A description of factors and implementation strategies used by schools in becoming effective for all students*. Paper presented at the Conference Name|. Retrieved Access Date|. from URL|.
- Pressley, M., Solic, K., Gaskins, I. W., & Collins, S. (2006). A portrait of benchmark school: How a school produces high achievement in students who previously failed. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 98(2), 282-306.
- Price, J. L. (1972). The study of organisational effectiveness. *Sociological Quarterly*, 13(3), 3-15.
- Purkey, S. C., and Smith, M.S. (1983). Effective schools: A review. *The Elementary School Journal*, 83(4), 427-452.
- Quinby, N. (1985). Improving the place called school: a conversation with John Goodlad. *Educational Leadership*, 42(6), 16 - 19.
- Ralph, J. H., and Fennessey, J. (1983). Science or reform: Some questions about the effective school model. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 64(10), 589-694.
- Reed, P. (April, 1998). *An investigation of leadership in effective and noneffective urban schoolwide project schools*. San Diego: American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting.
- Reid, K., Hopkins, D., & Holly, P. (1987). *Towards the effective school*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Reynolds , D. (2000). School effectiveness; The international dimension. In C. Teddlie & D. Reynolds (Eds.), *The International Handbook of School Effectiveness Research* (pp. 232-282). London: Falmer Press.

- Reynolds, D., Stringfield, S., Teddlie, C., and Creemers, B. (2002). The intellectual and policy context. In D. Reynolds, Creemers, B., Stringfield, S., Teddlie, C. & Schaffer, G (Ed.), *World class school: International perspectives on school effectiveness*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Reynolds, D., Creemers, B., Nesselrodt, P. S., Schaffer, G., Stringfield, S., & Teddlie, C. (1994). *Advances in school effectiveness research and practice*. Oxford: Pergammon.
- Reynolds, D., Creemers, B., Stringfield, S., Teddlie, C., & Schaffer, G. (Eds.). (2002). *World class schools: International perspectives on school effectiveness*. London: Routledge-Falmer.
- Reynolds, D., & Cuttance, P. (Eds.). (1992). *School effectiveness research, policy and practice*. London: Cassell.
- Reynolds, D., Hopkins, D., & Stoll, L. (1993). Linking school effectiveness knowledge and school improvement practice: Towards a synergy, . *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 4(1), 37-58.
- Reynolds, D., & Teddlie, C. (2000a). The future agenda for school effectiveness research. In C. Teddlie, & Reynolds, D (Ed.), *The international handbook of school effectiveness research*. (pp. 322 - 343). London: Falmer Press.
- Reynolds, D., & Teddlie, C. (2000b). The process of school effectiveness. In C. Teddlie & D. Reynolds (Eds.), *The International Handbook of School Effectiveness* (pp. 134-159). London: Falmer Press.
- Roland, K. Y. (2006). Learning institution to learning organization: Kudos to reflective practitioners. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 30(5), 396-419.
- Rosenholtz, S. J. (1985). Effective schools: interpreting the evidence. *American Journal of Education*, 93(3), 352 - 388.
- Rosenshine, B. (1987). Direct instruction. In M. J. Dunkin (Ed.), *The international encyclopedia of teaching and teacher education*. Oxford: Pergammon Press.
- Rosenshine, B., & Stevens, R. (1986). Teaching functions. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), *Third handbook of research on teaching*. New York: Macmillan.
- Rousseau, D. (1990). Assessing organizational culture: The case for multiple methods. In B. Schneider (Ed.), *Organizational climate and culture* (pp. 153-192). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Rutter, M. (1983). School effects and pupil progress: Findings and policy implications. *Child Development*, 54(1), 1-29.

- Rutter, M., Maughan, B., Mortimore, P., Ouston, J., & Smith, A. (1979). *Fifteen thousand hours: Secondary schools and their effects on children*. London: Open Books and Boston, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sammons, P., Hillman, J., & Mortimore, P. (1995). *Characteristics of the effective schools: A review of the school effectiveness research*. London: OFSTED and University of London, Institute of Education.
- Sammons, P., Thomas, S., Mortimore, P., Cairns, R., & Bausor, I. (1994, 9th September). *Understanding the process of school and departmental effectiveness* Paper presented at the School effectiveness and school improvement: Bridging the divide at the Annual Conference of the British Educational Research Association, St. Anne's College, University of Oxford.
- Scheerens, J. (1992). *Effective schooling: Research, theory and practice*. London: Cassell.
- Scheerens, J. (1997). Conceptual models and theory-Embedded principles on effective schooling. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 8(3), 269-310.
- Scheerens, J., Glas, C., & Thomas, S.M. (2003). *Educational evaluation, assessment, and monitoring-a systematic approach*. The Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger Publishers.
- Scieszka, G. (1996). *Key indicators of effective rural elementary schools as perceived by parents and teachers* Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Boston College, Boston.
- Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The arts and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Currency and Doubleday.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1984). Leadership and excellence in schooling. *Educational Leadership*, 41, 4-13.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1996). *Moral leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Shahril @ Charil bin Marzuki. (1997). *Kajian sekolah berkesan di Malaysia: Model lima faktor*. Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Bangi.
- Sharifah Md Nor. (2003). *Keberkesanan sekolah: Satu perspektif sosiologi*. Serdang: Penerbit Universiti Putra Malaysia.
- Shaw, E. (1997). The real network of small firms. In D. Deakins, P. Jennings & C. Mason (Eds.), *Small Firms: Entrepreneurship in the 1990's* London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Shaw, E. (1999). A guide to the qualitative research process: evidence from a small firm study. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 2(2), 59-70.
- Shoemaker, B. (1991). *Integrative education: A curriculum for the twenty first century* (No. 33/2): Oregon School Study Council.

- Shoemaker, J. (1989). *The school effectiveness report: History, current status, future directions*: Connecticut State Board of Education.
- Shukla, S. (1974). Achievement of Indian children in another tongue(Hindi) and science. *Comparative Education Review*, 18(2), 237-261.
- Slavin, R. E. (1987). A theory of school and classroom organisation. *Educational Psychologist*, 22(2), 89-108.
- Slekar, T. D. (2005). Without 1, where would we begin? Small sample research in educational setting. *Journal of Thought*(Spring), 79-85.
- Smith, D. J., & Tomlinson, S. (1989). *The school effect. A study of multi-racial comprehensives*. London: Policy Studies Institute.
- Smith, R. (2002). *Creating the effective primary school: A guide for school leaders and teachers*. London: Kagan Page.
- Southworth, G. (1994). The learning school In P. Ribbens & E. BurrIDGE (Eds.), *Improving education: Promoting quality in schools* London: Cassell.
- Steers, R. M. (1975). Problems in the measurement of organisational effectiveness. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 20, 546-558.
- Stoll, A., & Fink, A. (1996). *Changing our schools*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Stoll, A., & Fink, D. (1994). School effectiveness and school improvement: Voices from the field. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 5(2), 149-177.
- Stoll, A., & Myers, K. (1997). *No quick fixes: Perspective in schools in difficulty*. Lewes: Falmer Press.
- Stoll, L., Myers, K., & Reynolds, K. (1997). *No quick fixes: Perspectives on schools in difficulty*. Lewes: Falmer Press.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.
- Stringfield, S., & Teddlie, C. (1988). A time to summarize: The Louisiana school effectiveness study. *Educational Leadership*, 46(2), 43-49.
- Stringfield, S., & Teddlie, C. (1991). School, cclassroom and student-level indicators of rural school effectiveness. *Journal of Research in rural education* 7(3).
- Sweeney, J. (1982). Research synthesis on effective school leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 39(5), 346 - 352.

- Sweetland, S. R., & Hoy, W. K. (December 2000). School characteristics and educational model of student achievement in middle schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 36(5), 703-729.
- Taberer, R. (1994). *School and teacher effectiveness*. Slough: NFER.
- Tam, W. M. (2007). Rethinking school and community relation in Hong Kong. *Journal of Educational Management*, 21(4), 350-366.
- Taylor, B. M., Pressley, M. P. and Pearson, P. D. (2002). Research-supported characteristics of teachers and schools that promote reading achievement. In P. D. P. Taylor. B.M. (Ed.), *Teaching reading: Effective schools, accomplished teachers* (pp. 361-374). Mahwah, New Jersey: Erlbaum.
- Taylor, D. L., Teddlie, C., Freeman, J., & Pounders, M. (1998). A child's day at school: Variations in more and less effective schools in low-and middle-socioeconomic status contexts. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 3(2), 115-132.
- Teddlie, C., & Reynolds, D. (2000). *The international handbook of school effectiveness research*. London: Falmer Press.
- Teddlie, C., & Stringfield, S. (1985). A differential analysis of effectiveness in middle and lower social economic status schools. *Journal of Classroom Interaction*(20), 38-44.
- Teddlie, C., & Stringfield, S. (1993). *Schools do make a difference: Lesson learned from a 10-year study of school effects*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Ten Dam, G., & Volman, M. (2001). The leeway of qualitative educational research: a case study. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 14(6), 757-769.
- Thomas, S., & Smees, R. (2000, 24-28 April). *Dimensions of Secondary School Effectiveness: Comparative Analyses across Regions*, American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.
- Tizard, J., Schoefield, W., & Hewison, J. (1982). Symposium: Reading- collaboration between teachers and parents in assissting, children's reading *British journal of educational psychology*, 52, 1-15.
- Tomlinson, J., & Mortimore, P. (1992). *Small, rural and effective schools*. London: University Of Warwick.
- Townsend, T. (1997). What makes schools effective? A comparison between school communities in Australia and the USA. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 8(3), 311-326.
- Trinidad, C., & Normore, A. H. (2005). Leadership and gender: A dangerous liaison? *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 25(7), 574-590.

- Truitt, R. L. (2003). *Rising from the ashes: How changes in leadership and school culture turned a low performing elementary school into a high performing learning community*. University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
- Tyler, W. (1988). *School organisation: A sociological perspective*. London: Croom Helm Ltd.
- Ubben, G. C., & Hughes, L. W. (1987). *The principalship: Creative leadership for effective schools*. Newton, M.A: Allyn & Bacon.
- US Department of Education. (1987). *What works*. Washington DC: Government Printing Office.
- Van der Werf, G. (1997). Differences in school and instruction characteristics between high, average and low-effective schools. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 8(4), 430-448.
- VanHoutte, M. (2005). Climate or culture? A plea for conceptual clarity in school effectiveness research. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 16(1).
- Venezky, R. L., & Winfield, L. F. (1979). *Schools that succeed beyond expectation in reading*. (No. Studies on Technical Report No.1). Newark: University of Delaware.
- Vulliamy, G. (1987). School effectiveness research in Papua New Guinea. *Comparative Education*, 23(2), 209-223.
- Walberg, H. J. (1984). Improving the productivity of American schools. *Educational Leadership*, 41, 19-27.
- Walberg, H. J. (1985). Homework's powerful effects on learning. *Educational Leadership*, 42(7), 76-79.
- Wang, M. C., Haertel, G. D., & Walberg, H. J. (1993). Towards a knowledge base for school learning. *Review of Educational Research*, 63(3), 249-294.
- Warner, K. W. (1967). Problems in measuring goals of voluntary associations *Journal of Adult Education*(19), 3-14.
- Waters, J. T., & Marzano, R. J. (2006). *School district leadership that works: The effect of superintendent leadership on student achievement*. Denver: McREL.
- Weber, G. (1971). *Inner-city children can be taught to read: Four successful schools*. Washington, D.C: Council for Basic Education.
- Weber, J. R. (1989). Leading the instructional program. In S. C. Smith & P. K. Piele (Eds.), *School Leadership: Handbook for Excellence*(3rd edition) (pp. 191-224). Eugene,OR: Educational Resources Information Centre, Clearing House on Educational Management.

- Weick, K. E. (1976). Educational organisation as loosely coupled systems. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21(1), 1-19.
- Wellish, J. B., MacQueen, A. H., Carriere, R. A., & Duck, G. A. (1978). School management and organisation in successful schools. *Sociology of Education*, 51(3), 211-226.
- Williams, T., & Kirst, M. (2006). School practices that matter. *Leadership*, 35(4), 8-10.
- Wong, K.-c. (2005). Conditions and practices of successful principalship in Shanghai. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 43(6), 552-562.
- Woodside, A. G., & Wilson, E. J. (2003). Case study research methods for theory building. *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, 18(6/7), 493-508.
- Yeo, R. K. (2006). Learning institution to learning organization: Kudos to reflective practitioners. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 30(5).
- Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Yuchman, E., & Seashore, S. E. (1967). A system resource approach to organisational effectiveness. *American Sociological Review*, 32, 891-903.
- Zigarelli, M. A. (1996). An empirical test of conclusions from effective schools research. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 90(2), 103-108.